The Planning Commission for the City of Junction City met on Tuesday, March 19, 2013, at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City Oregon.

PRESENT WERE: Commissioners, Brad Lemhouse (Chair), Jeff Haag, Jenna Wheeler, Kenneth Weaver, Sandra Dunn, Patricia Phelan and Jason Thiesfeld; Planner, Stacy Clauson; Interim City Administrator, Melissa Bowers; and Planning Secretary, Tere Andrews; ABSENT: Planning Commission Alternate, James Hukill

I. OPEN MEETING AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Lemhouse opened the meeting at 6:30 and led the Pledge of Allegiance. The agenda was reviewed.

II. Public Comments (for items not already on the agenda)

There were none.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

•FEBRUARY 19, 2013

•Motion: Commissioner Thiesfeld made a motion to approve the February 19, 2013 minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dunn.

Vote: 7:0:0

Chair Lemhouse, Commissioners, Haag, Weaver, Thiesfeld, Wheeler, Phelan and Dunn voted in favor.

IV. PLANNING COMMISSION RECRUITMENT

Planner Clauson said there had been a planning commission alternate position vacant by ordinance there was a 60 application period. There was one (1) application.

Planning Commissioner Wheeler notified Planner Clauson earlier in the day that she was resigning. Clarification on how the position would be filled would come from the City Council at their next meeting.

•Motion: Commissioner Phelan made a motion recommend to City Council approval of Mr. Jack Sumner to fill the Planning Commission alternate position. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dunn.

Vote: 7:0:0

Chair Lemhouse, Commissioners, Haag, Weaver, Thiesfeld, Wheeler, Phelan and Dunn voted in favor.

H:\My Box Files\Planning Department\Planning Commission Agendas Minutes Reports\Packets\2013\07 16 13\03 19 13 Draft PC minutes.doc

V. SIGN STANDARDS – MODIFICATIONS TO THE SIGN CODE TO ADDRESS BANNER SIGNS

Planner Clauson explained this was a follow up to an issue that was before the Planning Commission at their February meeting. The proposed revisions would:

• Increase the number of daily display signs allowed from one (1) to two (2) and potentially more

Amend the allowable sign area provisions for daily display signs

- Create a new specific type of sign with a height standard slightly higher which would accommodate a banner style sign which was requested by the Community Development Committee.
- Establish spacing standards which would keep the signs from being grouped in clumps

Commissioner Dunn suggested there should be input from downtown business owners.

Planner Clauson suggested the public outreach be done before the public hearing. In the meantime an email could also be sent out to business owners advising them of the next opportunity to give input.

Commissioner Dunn asked if there were pictures to share with business owners.

Administrator Bowers replied there were pictures.

The Commission discussed the appearance and placement of some existing signs.

Planner Clauson said city did not regulate the content or design of the signs except as to size and placement.

Chair Lemhouse added that portion of the regulation was not proposed to be changed.

Commissioner Thiesfeld note the city would control the spacing of the banner signs by the placement of the holes in the concrete (for the banner signs).

Planner Clauson agreed however the spacing standard was intended to address placement of the 'A' frame (sandwich board) sign between banner signs.

Chair Lemhouse asked if the banners currently displayed from utility poles would be subject to the proposed standards.

Administrator Bowers replied those banners fell under a different part of the sign code.

Commissioner Dunn asked if they would need to come down.

H:\My Box Files\Planning Department\Planning Commission Agendas Minutes Reports\Packets\2013\07 16 13\03 19 13 Draft PC minutes.doc

Administrator Bowers replied there was no proposal to remove them.

Chair Lemhouse said the proposed standards addressed daily display signs specifically.

Planner Clauson agreed.

Commissioner Haag was supportive of the additional signs. His concern was visibility at the corners on Ivy Street particularly at W 6th and W 7th Avenues and the ability for pedestrians to use the sidewalk.

Planner Clauson responded the current ordinance required the signs be placed "so to allow at least five (5) feet of unimpeded pedestrian sidewalk maneuvering space."

Chair Lemhouse asked if sandwich board signs were allowed on private property.

Planner Clauson replied the proposed changes concentrated on the off-premise daily display signs. There was a separate section which (17.115.080) addressed on-premise daily display signs. It stated there should be one (1) daily display sign per business for which the maximum permitted area was eight (8) square feet and 16 square feet overall with a maximum height of six (6) feet. Staff did not propose any changes to the on-site sign provisions.

Chair Lemhouse asked about current banner height and size regulations.

Planner Clauson replied that was a question for the Planning Commission, did they want to allow a different square footage. The difficulty with the current provisions was the height limit which was four and one-half feet (4'6") did not accommodate the banner style signs that were of interest to the Design Subcommittee. The proposed six (6) square feet was from the City of Corvallis which had banner style sign provisions.

Commissioner Weaver recommended the Commission look at the Corvallis standard as suggested and check with those interested in a banner sign program. He noted there were several different styles displayed at businesses currently. He felt a standard system was important such as a business improvement district regulations or something similar. He believed Corvallis had such a program. Without that there would not be a sense of control if that was important

The Commission discussed signs that were larger than the provisions allowed. It was noted if such signs were on private property the provision did not apply. Planner Clauson added the provisions applied to long-term signs.

Chair Lemhouse asked if the Department of Transportation (ODOT) had standards along Highway 99 (Ivy Street).

Planner Clauson offered to notice ODOT of the proposed regulations and invite their participation.

H:\My Box Files\Planning Department\Planning Commission Agendas Minutes Reports\Packets\2013\07 16 13\03 19 13 Draft PC minutes.doc

Commissioner Weaver moved the commission endorse the proposed provisions presented by staff.

Chair Lemhouse asked if any of the Commissioners had concerns with any of the proposals.

There were general comments that they did not have concerns.

Consensus: the consensus of the Planning Commission was to recommend to City Council move forward with the proposed revisions as written.

The Commission next discussed the process involved in moving forward. Planner Clauson explained there would be a series of public hearings.

Administrator Bowers asked Planner Clauson if an option would be to notify the Council of the Planning Commission intent to move forward with the amendment process in regard to the proposed changes to the sign ordinance.

Planner Clauson responded certainly. If the Council concurred, the public hearings would need to be scheduled and noticed.

Chair Lemhouse asked if he was correct in that the proposed schedule would need to be pushed back.

Planner Clauson agreed. She recommended the public hearing schedule be pushed back pending the Council decision.

Commissioner Haag asked if that would hurt the people trying to get their banners put up before summer.

Administrator Bowers replied the Planning Commission was following the appropriate process.

Chair Lemhouse state they should go ahead and forward the question to City Council.

He checked with the Commissioners, there were no objections.

VI. PLANNING ACTIVITY REPORT

Planner Clauson reported at their last meeting, the City Council chose not to take action on the ordinance forward to them by the Planning Commission regarding the keeping of chickens and bees within the city limits.

The Transportation System Plan update was moving forward. An open house was held in March. They were compiling the results from the open house as well as an on-line survey. They survey was kept open to allow more time for additional responses. She

encouraged everyone to take the survey located on the city's website. The intent was to gauge the community's issues and/or priorities.

The Junction City Comprehensive Plan update went before the Lane County Board of Commissioners and was co-adopted. It would next go to the State (Department of Land Conservation and Development). The 21-day clock would begin once the notices were sent to those on the interested parties list. She hoped to have the submission into DLCD by the end of the week.

Commissioner Haag asked how they would go about helping the owner of the ministorage. The property was zoned commercial at the time of construction. At some point it was re-zoned with a residential designation.

Commissioner Weaver said it would be a legislative issue then.

Planner Clauson agreed.

Chair Lemhouse asked the Commission if they wanted to take the question to the City Council before proceeding.

Commissioners Haag and Thiesfeld said the property owner asked about the issue quite some time ago. However, it was on hold because of the UGB (Comprehensive Plan update).

Commissioner Thiesfeld said there were a couple other issued he would like to see addressed.

Commissioner Weaver suggested they be reviewed collectively. As such it would be a legislative change.

Commissioner Haag asked if there were other situations similar to the mini storage.

Planner Clauson answered there may be others. Some investigation would be needed because there were areas where the uses did not necessarily match the zoning or the comprehensive plan. The question was, if it was intentional.

Chair Lemhouse noted there were costs involved. He preferred to review them as a group.

VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Planner Clauson advised there may be a land use application, a quasi-judicial application, coming before the Planning Commission.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Commissioner Phelan made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dunn.

Vote: 7:0:0

Chair Lemhouse, Commissioners, Haag, Weaver, Thiesfeld, Wheeler, Phelan and Dunn voted in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30p.m.

The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting would be Tuesday, April 16, 2013 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,	
Tere Andrews, Planning Secretary	Brad Lemhouse, Chair